

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-11 and 13-17 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 7 and 13 being the independent claims. Claims 1-5, 7-11 and 13-17 are sought to be amended. Claims 6, 12 and 18 are sought to be canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Entry and consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter is believed to have been introduced by this Amendment.

Applicant has made the above Amendment to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding objections and rejections.

Objections under 37 CFR 1.75(c)

Claims 6, 12 and 18 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claims 6, 12 and 18 have been canceled rendering the objection to these claims moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-15, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,118,492 (hereinafter referred to as "Milnes et al."). Claims 4, 10 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Milnes et al. Claims 6, 12 and 18 have been canceled rendering the

rejections to these claims moot. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections with regard to pending claims 1-5, 7-11 and 13-17 since Milnes et al. does not teach or suggest each element of amended independent claims 1, 7 and 13 for at least the following reason.

Independent claims 1, 7 and 13 have been amended to include a similar feature of allowing the content service provider to determine a number of line items that are then allocated in an electronic program guide to represent content information from the content service provider. The content service provider is then charged an amount for each of the allocated line items in the electronic program guide. In the present invention, the more line items allocated in the electronic programming guide to represent content information, the harder it is to maintain the electronic programming guide. Thus, the present invention provides for a way to charge the content service provider for each line item allocated to it in the electronic program guide.

In contrast, Milnes et al. discloses a television (TV) schedule system which displays less program information, thereby lowering the program cost (*see, e.g.,* Milnes et al, column 2, lines 41-43). Milnes et al. discloses that not all channels which are available on the user's television system are represented within the program guide (*see, e.g.,* Milnes et al, column 4, lines 22-24). Here, the system operator can use a variety of criteria to determine which channels are to be represented (*see, e.g.,* Milnes et al, column 4, lines 33-34). For example, the system operator in Milnes et al. may charge each broadcaster to be listed on this particular guide (*see, e.g.,* Milnes et al, column 4, lines 36-37). The system operator may also charge an additional fee, per time slot, to make a specific program "special". (*see, e.g.,* Milnes et al, column 4, lines 38-39). A number of different schemes can be used to draw the user's

attention to special programs, for example, the program may be listed first in the program guide, shown in a different typeface, presented in a different color, or given additional space for a program description (*see, e.g.,* Milnes et al, column 4, lines 39-44). The program guide of Milnes et al. does not teach or suggest allowing the content service provider to determine a number of line items that are then allocated in an electronic program guide to represent content information from the content service provider, and then charging the content service provider an amount for each of the allocated line items in the electronic program guide. Therefore, for at least this reason, independent claims 1, 7 and 13 (and their dependent claims 2-5, 8-11 and 14-17) are patentable over Milnes et al. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Appln. Serial No. 09/823,566
Reply to non-final Office Action mailed on May 31, 2005

INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-3311
if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action. Thus, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Dated: August 30, 2005

/Molly A. McCall/Reg. No. 46,126
Molly A. McCall
(703) 633-3311

P10859 Reply to Nonfinal OA

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1400, Arlington, VA 22213 on:

August 30, 2005

Katherine Jennings
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

Signature _____ Date August 30, 2005